

November 5, 2013 LUEAAC Agenda Item Comments

Comments on the Newport Beach Land Use Element Amendment Advisory Committee agenda from:
Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

Item 2. Approval of Minutes (October 1, 2013 Meeting)

Page 1:

- Jim Walker is listed under both “Members Present” and “Members Absent.” It seems unlikely this is correct. My recollection is he was absent (or arrived very late?).
- Under IV.A, it might be useful to spell out an acronym whose meaning is not likely to be obvious to some current readers, and certainly not clear to most future ones: “CAP” (= Citizens Advisory Panel).

Page 2:

- The line preceding Item V seems to end in midsentence. Should the final “to” be deleted?
- Under “c. Lyon Communities,” a word seems to be missing from the end of the last sentence. Was it meant to read: “... *and the Committee could recommend a less intense use*”?

Attachment No. 2 Policy Comments from Committee Members

1. The agenda suggests this is related to discussion Item 3 (“Schedule of Land Use Element Goal and Policy Review”). I have some difficulty making that connection. It looks, instead, like a list of Land Use goals and policies may have been sent to the LUEAAC members with instructions at the top of the first page that are now partially obscured by an overlay box. The responses would seem to may play more into agenda Item 5 (“Scope of Policy Revisions”) than Item 3?
2. It is truly admirable that Committee members Tucker and Watkins took the time to read through the list and to offer their comments and suggested modifications. In many cases it might have been helpful to indicate the reasons for the suggested modifications. I assume that will come out at this meeting or a later one?
3. For the benefit of the public, and perhaps for the benefit of the other Committee members, it might be helpful to combine the responses into a single integrated list, showing *all* the goals and policies, and highlighting or notating the places where comments or changes were suggested, and by whom. It would seem that might be more efficient than expecting each reader to flip between multiple lists (or use split screens) to determine what is consistent, and inconsistent, and also what may have been overlooked.